DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 793 IR 054 526

AUTHOR Elgin, Ramona R.
TITLE Comparison of Book and Video Circulation in Public Libraries.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 25p.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Books; Comparative Analysis; Librarians; Library Administration; *Library Circulation; *Library Collections; Library Statistics; Library Surveys; Library Technical Processes; *Public Libraries; Questionnaires; Users (Information); *Videotape Cassettes
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois; *Library Directors

ABSTRACT

To determine whether videocassettes have become an integral part of library collections, a survey was conducted to compare book and video circulation statistics during a 5-year period in northern Illinois. A survey was sent to directors of the 84 public libraries in the Suburban Library System in northern Illinois requesting the population of each library's service area, the number of books and videos in the collection, their circulation over a 5-year period, charging and checkout practices, and interlibrary loan policies. Fifty-one directors replied. There appears to be little standardization in video circulation periods, costs, and collection organization and retrieval. There is not much correlation between video and book circulation, although circulation does appear to increase when charging for videos is dropped. Results also demonstrate that libraries do not keep or retain their statistics in the same manner. Only about half of the libraries allow videos to go out on interlibrary loan. Most objections to such loans may have resulted from the newness of videos in the collections and the lack of standardization in their storage and retrieval. Nine tables present survey findings. The 19-item questionnaire is included. (Contains 9 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Northern Illinois University
Department of Library and Information Studies

ED356793

Comparison of Book and Video Circulation in Public Libraries

by
Ramona R. Elgin

A Report Prepared Under the Direction of
Dr. Deanne Holzberlein
In Fulfillment of the Requirements
for LIBS 571

DeKalb, Illinois
Fall 1992

1205526

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ramona Elgin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Background and References 1

Purpose of This Study 5

Methodology 5

Results of the Survey Responses 6

Conclusions 15

Bibliography 17

Appendix A: Survey 18

Appendix B: Tabulation of Results 19

Comparison of Book and Video Circulation

In Public Libraries

Introduction

Throughout history, libraries have been places to obtain textual material for information, enjoyment and entertainment. However, as libraries began to introduce audio-visual materials into their collections, questions arose as to their appropriateness in libraries. Video cassettes, in particular, have caused great discussion and concern. Some of the concerns were about the video cassettes ethical place in the library, since they could be obtained in the public sector; the effect of video cassettes on book circulation, and the impact of video cassettes on patron reading.

Background and References

There are few articles on the circulation of videos. There are some articles on the early introduction of video cassettes into public library collections. Also there are articles on charging fees for the use of video cassettes from a library, and the impact of this on local video businesses.

Will Mainly wrote, in an article for Wilson Library Bulletin (June 1990) stating seven reasons public libraries should not add videos to their collections. Mainly reasoned that since most shopping centers, supermarkets, convenience stores, gas stations and drugstores carry videos, why should the library duplicate the services of the private sector. Just as people don't buy Playboy for its articles, people don't often check out videos for educational

purposes. Videos are usually circulated for pleasure viewing. Videos are not cheap items for libraries to purchase. The money a library spends on videos must come from the ;materials budget, which in turn decreases the amount of print material, sound recordings, etc. that can be purchased for the collection. Libraries could also be asking for censorship problems by adding video cassettes to their collections. Purchasing video cassettes with 'R' or 'X' ratings can cause censorship problems, as well as not purchasing them, because of their ratings. Despite the fact that public libraries are supposed to be "free" institutions, some libraries charge fees for their use. The poor may not be able to afford these fees, thereby eliminating them from the use of this service. Videos in the collection does bring in more patrons, according to Mainly, but most of these patrons are nonreaders and therefore will not use the print resources available to them. Lastly, Mainly felt videos were turning readers into sofa spuds, as more patrons go straight to the video shelves, instead of the book shelves.

There was an article in Library Journal (April 15, 1988) on a study done by the Heartland Institute, a Chicago-based public policy research group dedicated to the free-market perspectives. The results of their study were that "video cassette lending in libraries threaten to take business from private video stores, restricts access to other library services, and wastes tax dollars on what is essentially entertainment for middle class families." It was suggested that if libraries want to offer videos they should restrict themselves to cultural and reference materials.

Michigan and Maryland have had legal battles over fees for videos in public libraries. In American Libraries (June 1987), it was stated that a bill had stalled in the House of

Representatives to "ban public libraries from offering fee-based video loans in an attempt to halt what some local merchants see as unfair competition." Marianne Gessner, executive director of the Michigan Library Association told the legislators that passage amounted to "economic censorship" and that fees were the only way libraries could afford to keep up their collections.

There was an article in the Library Journal (April 15, 1988) about the Maryland state attorney's ruling on public libraries charging fees for video use. The Michigan State Attorney ruled that libraries cannot charge fees for borrowing videos. His reasoning was that public libraries are free institutions and that charging for video use violates the meaning and spirit of free public libraries.

There have also been several positive positions taken on videos in public libraries. In Illinois Libraries (January 1988) there was an article about the Jefferson Park Branch Library of the Chicago Public Library and their attempt to combine video and book usage. They packaged videos, particularly children's videos, with a paperback copy of the book from which the video was made. This was done to encourage reading as well as viewing. The video package, tape and book, circulate for one week to allow reading time.

An academic librarian, Grant Burns of the University of Michigan, Flint campus, wrote an article on videos and books for Library Journal in 1990 (November 15, 1990). In "We Are Not Vidiots," Burns stated that he borrows videos from his public library to encourage his children to read the books. They view the video and read the books. Then he discusses with them the differences and similarities between the two. They discuss the acting, screenwriting, cinematography, directing and accompanying music, also.

In an issue of West Virginia Libraries (Fall 1984), Barbara Caron, Director of the Morgantown Public Library wrote an article on "Video Cassettes in the Public Library." In the first year a dozen titles generated a hundred circulations. The second year, the collection of 235 video cassettes had a circulation of 4,721. In 1984, the collection had grown to 355 tapes and the circulation had topped 11,500. Videos account for less than 1/2 percent of their total collection, yet videos account for more than six percent of the annual circulation. Caron also stated that videos have brought in "hard core non-users" to the library and they have become library supporters.

Jim Watkins wrote an article for Public Libraries (Fall 1987) on the results of a survey of 100 library patrons on the Dunham County Public Library in North Carolina. Watkins survey asked the patrons questions about their choice of using the library, what they used while at the library, and their satisfaction. He received 64 replies to his survey and got the following results:

(1) patrons use the public library for non-print materials primarily because in the library these materials are free,

(2) patrons who visit the public library in order to use non-print tend to use print ;materials as well during their visit, and

(3) there is no correlation between patrons' use and satisfaction with non-print materials in the public library and their evaluation of the importance of their overall library use.

In a major study published in 1988 called Home Video in Libraries: How Libraries Buy and Circulate Prerecorded Home Video, case studies were conducted on video ownership and circulation in public libraries in communities of varying sizes. Because of the video

collections, library registrations were found to be up in most libraries, thereby also increasing book circulation. The average video collection is only a small portion of the budget, yet it represents an average of 20% to 21% of the total annual circulation. The libraries in this study varied in size and were located throughout the United States.

Purpose of This Study

Libraries have noticed an increase in patron registration since the advent of videos in the library collection. Schiller Park Public Library in a Chicago suburb has noticed this increase. From all appearances it is accompanied by an increase in book circulation, too. The increase in book circulation may be approximately the same as the increase in video circulation, for the size of the collection. This study will look at a comparison of the book and video circulation statistics during a five year period.

Have videos become an integral part of the public library collection? This study will compare the circulation statistics of videos with those of the books in the public libraries studies. The increase and/or decrease of video cassette and book circulations may be closely related. The main differences that have bearing on these numbers are fees and loaning practice differences between books and videos. These variables will be studied to show their impact on circulation statistics.

Methodology

A survey was sent to the directors of the 84 public libraries in the Suburban Library System in northern Illinois. The survey asked for the population of each library's service area, the number of videos and books in the collection and their circulation over a five year period (where these figures were available), what each library's charging and checkout

practices are for videos and if these practices are the same for their book collection. The questionnaire also asked about interlibrary loan policies for both books and videos.

The percentage of increase and/or decrease in circulation between the years covered will be compared by library population size. The amounts, if any, charged for videos, the length of circulation and whether the library's circulation policies are the same for books and videos will also be compared with the results of the comparison by library and the increase and/or decrease in circulation.

Results of the Survey Responses

Surveys were sent to the 84 public libraries in the Suburban Library System with 51 or 60.71% returned by the directors. The surveys were numbered in order received, to provide a key to each set of data. The following results are covered by the question number on the survey. For a copy of the survey instrument, see the Appendix.

Question #1

The distribution of these 51 libraries by population served can be seen in Table 1. More than half of these libraries fell into the first two size categories, from 10,000 to 15,000 population. The rest of the libraries were rather evenly spread over the rest of the population ranges.

Question #2

Of the 51 responding libraries, four did not have video collections. These four, #6, #19, #20 and #28 were 5.88% of the responses. Out of these four, two provided reasons why they did not have video collections. Library #19 stated that previous to the budget cuts at Suburban Library System, they had access to "SAVS" (Suburban Audio Visual System),

that service has now been severely cut. The other library, #28, stated that their library contracts all their services with another library.

Therefore, 92.15% of the responding libraries, or 47 libraries had in-house video collections. These 47 libraries and their data were used for the rest of the study.

Question #3

When the video collections of the remaining 47 libraries were compared by population served, there was very little correlation between the number of videos owned and the population served in the first size category. In the 10,000 or less population served category the video cassette collection size varied from 281 to 2300 videos with two libraries not providing any collection size figures.

There was a closer correlation in the 10,001 to 15,000 population size group, between the number of videos owned and the population served. Of the libraries in this group, ten of them have collection sizes that vary from 269 to 800 videos.

One library, #5, just started their video collection in 1991 and now state they have 18 videos. The last two libraries in this category, #10 and #24 have 1500 and 1900 videos respectively, in their collections.

As their were only two libraries in the 15,001-20,000 population served category, it was impossible to develop a pattern of ownership. Library #29 started their video collection in 1992 while library #39 started their collection with 800 videos.

There was a smaller span of collection size in the 20,001 to 25.000 population served category. These collections went from 718 to 1044, in size. Of these five libraries, four were very close in size of collection.

Of the five libraries in the 25,001 to 30,000 population served category, two ere very close in video collection size. Library #51 and #40 stated their collection sizes to be 400 and 450, respectively. The other three libraries were also closely grouped with their collections sizes falling between 1100 to 1600 videos.

Again, in the population served category 30.001 to 35,000, it was difficult to develop a pattern because of the number of responses in this category. But the video collection size variance was not large. The collection size varied from 943 to 1200, between the three libraries.

In the last population category, there was a large difference in their video collections. With populations of more than 35,001, their collections varied from 854 to 3900 videos.

On the basis of these figures a few deductions can be made. The first would be that there seems to be little correlation between the population served and the size of the video collection owned by the library. This could be because they purchase on the basis of circulation or because of budget restrictions. There were, however, several groups that were closely related. These instances could be caused by budgets of approximately the same size or closely related population served make-up of the libraries involved in each category.

Question #4

As with the video collection sizes, the book collection sizes also seem to vary greatly when compared to the population size served by the library. In the less than 10,000 category, the book collection sizes varied from 12,000 to 85,240. This is a wide span and most of the libraries appeared to show a pattern.

Again, in the second size category of 10,001 to 15,000, the majority of the libraries

have closely related book collection sizes. The book collection sizes varied from 23,067 to 75,000. Of these 13 libraries, 10 varied from 23,067 to 46,544. These were somewhat close in size. The last three have larger gaps between them. Library #35, #24 and #1 had collections of 58,000, 65,000 and 75,000 respectively.

In the third size category of 15,001 to 20,000 only two libraries provide data for this study and no correlations can be assumed. The collection sizes of these two libraries were wide apart. Library #29 had a collection of 37,756 and #39 had a collection of 99,100 books.

The five libraries in the fourth category of 20,001 to 25,000, the book collection sizes were close in size. The lowest collection size was 71,688, with the largest being 94,244 books. The fifth category, 25.001 to 30,000 population served again showed a close grouping of three libraries with book collections varying from 37,000 to 64,000. The last two libraries were close with 80,000 and 85,000 books in their collections. The three libraries in the fifth population size category, had only two close size relationships. Library #16 stated their collection size as 53,524. However libraries #13 and #27 had collections of 90,408 and 89,092 respectively.

The last population size category was extremely varied between the six libraries. Their collection sizes varied from 69,756 to 190,000 volumes.

These great variations in book collection sizes could be caused by the types of circulation in the collections studied or it could be caused by the financial situations at each individual library. In those libraries which show a close relationship in collection size, it could be assumed that their populations served are similar or that they have a similar budget.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question #5 and #6

When comparing five years of video circulation and book circulation figures by the population size served, the figures for 1987 were used as a basis providing four years of the percentage of increase/decrease in each library's circulation. NA in the tables 2A through 2G will be explained as each is referred to. Unless otherwise indicated, the percentages in the tables are increases in circulation.

In Table 2A, it is shown that libraries #32, #46 and #47 did not provide any data about their circulation of either videos or books in their libraries. These spaces were filled in with the letter NA "Not Available." Library #32 gave for their reason for not providing circulation statistics that they don't keep any yearly figures on circulation. Libraries #46 and #47 gave no reason. Library #12 had only three years of circulation figures available. Library #21 did not start circulating videos until 1988, therefore there is no figures of increase/decrease for that year. Libraries #2 and #22 gave no circulation figures for videos and offered no explanation. You will note that there is not a percentage of increase/decrease nor an "NA" for library #17 for book circulation. After providing video circulation figures, they stated that it was not "policy to provide general circulation figures an exception had been made to provide video figures." Therefore, their columns were left blank.

There appears to be no definite pattern in the increases/decreases from year to year in this group of libraries. However, a majority of the time the percentages were increases for videos, although sometimes quite small increases. The book percentages seem to vary quite a bit more than the video percentages do.

Library #10 in Table 2B gave no circulation figures and provided the reason that they do

not give out their circulation figures. Library #5 also gave no circulation figures, however, they did state that they started their video collection in 1991 and had no figures as yet. Library #36 stated that they don't keep circulation figures from year to year. Library #14 provided no circulation figures for videos and libraries #33, #35 and #42 gave incomplete data as shown on the chart with "NA" for these year that apply.

In this particular group it can be seen by the chart that a majority of the percentages were increases. Some of these increases were quite large.

Table 2C is quite small, as there were only two libraries in this category. As with the other two categories, missing data is filled in with 'NA.' The increases and decreases are equally distributed.

In Table 2D, Library #45 provided only three years of video circulation figures and none for book circulation. They stated that book figures were too hard to figure. Three other libraries gave incomplete data and were filled in with 'NA' for the missing date. Once again, there were more increases than decreases in this category.

Library #26 in Table 2E stated on their survey that circulation figures for videos and books were too time consuming to provide. Once again the majority of the figures in this Table are increases.

Libraries #13 and #16 in Table 2F, did not provide any video circulation figures and stated that they only have one circulation figures for all materials and they compute no break out figures. Therefore, the book circulation figures are total figures for everything-- books, videos, cassettes, CDs, etc. Again, the majority of these figures are also increases.

Table 2G shows the circulation figures for the last population size group. Libraries #37

and #44 provided not circulation data for either videos or books. Library #37 stated that they kept no circulation figures and #44 gave no reason. As with the other groups, the majority of the figures are increases in circulation.

It can therefore be assumed that there has been, for the most part, a steady increase in video and book circulation over the last five years. It can also be seen that not all libraries appear to keep the same type of statistics on circulation, or in some case, keep not statistics at all.

Question #7 and 8

Most of the libraries in this study appear to charge the user for their videos. Only 34.62% of the libraries in this study do not charge their patrons for videos. This leave 65.38% charging for videos.

Five different sums were stated as being the amount charged for videos. The most common amount was $1.00 per video, which was the amount charged by 79.49% of the libraries. The other amounts stated were (by their frequency from low to high) $1.25, $1.50, $2.00, and $.50.

Question #9

Table 3 shows the results of video circulation after the listed libraries ceased charging for videos. As there were only three libraries who have ceased, it is not a firm fact that circulation will increase, however, there was a definite increase in the circulation of videos in these three libraries after they stopped charging for videos.

Question #10

The circulation period for videos appears to vary from library to library and even within

a library from type of video to type of video. Many libraries stated they have separate circulation periods for children's, popular and non-fiction videos. The most common circulation period was 3 days with 38.98% of the libraries using this time period. Next two most popular were 2 week and 2 days at 22.03% and 20.34% respectively. The longest period of time mentioned was 3 weeks by only one library and it was for non-fiction only.

Question #11

There seemed to be no standard method for the shelving of videos among the libraries in this study. 'All together alphabetically by title' and 'Fiction by title, Non-fiction separate by call number' were the two most common methods of shelving videos, with 25% of the libraries using each method. The next most popular method, with 14.58%, was to shelve by 'accession number.' Four libraries stated that they shelved adult popular, children, and nonfiction videos all separately. The rest were a variety of methods, including one library that stated that they shelved videos in no particular order at all.

Question #12 and 13

An overwhelming majority of the libraries, 78.72%, list their videos in their catalog for patron access. Of those who don't list videos in their catalog, 76.92% use video lists to inform patrons of what is owned in their collection. The remaining libraries rely on the patrons just looking at the shelves to see what is available.

Question #14 and 15

There doesn't seem to be any standard amount of videos that can be checked out at any one time among the libraries studied. checking out of two videos, 3 videos at a time and 'no limit' appear to be the most commonly used quantities. Two videos was most common, with

29.17% and 25% for both 3 videos and 'no limit.'

More than half of the libraries stated that anyone (including a Chicago patron with a Suburban Library card) can check out videos at their library. With 56.25% allowing anyone to check out videos, the next highest was 27.08% allowing only adults from their library to check out videos and 10.42% allow anyone in the Suburban Library System to check out videos from their library. Only 6.25% allow anyone, including children, from their library to check out videos.

Question #16 and #17

It was almost an even split on whether an individual library allows videos to go out on interlibrary loan. Those who do allow videos to go out amounted to 52.83% of the libraries. The remaining libraries gave the following reasons for not sending out videos on interlibrary loan: 20% said they couldn't collect fees for usage, 16.67% said patron use was too heavy, 13.33% stated board policy as their reason and another 13.33% stated they feared damage to videos in transit and lastly 6.67% stated that their videos were not online.

Question #18 and #19

Most of the libraries studied did not have the same interlibrary loan policies for both videos and books. Those that do have the same policies amounted to 45.65% of the libraries studied. Of the 54.35% that do not have the same interlibrary loan policies for both videos and books, their reasons were stated as follows (in order of most often mentioned to least mentioned):

board policy,

short loan period,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

not popular movies,

cost of videos/damage to videos,

small collection of videos and not online,

local demand too high,

patron inconvenience, and

inability to collect fees.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be made from this study. First, their appears to be little standardization in video circulation periods, costs, and in video collection organization and retrieval. This could be due to the newness of videos in library collections and the best methods to serve these purposes may not yet have been found.

Second, there appears to be little correlation between video and book circulations, however, circulation does appear to increase when charging for the videos is dropped. There does appear to be some noticeable comparisons between population size served and the size of the collection available in some of the library groups studied. However, this can not be claimed as a widely accepted fact, due to the small amount of libraries in some of the categories.

Third, there also appears to be little standardization in the way libraries keep their statistics and how long they retain the statistics they do generate. It was assumed at the beginning of this study that all libraries wanted to know which parts of their total collection was used most and that circulation figures would be available. These figures, it was assumed, would be used for collection development. This was an error. It was also

unexpected to find several of the libraries to be unwilling to reveal their circulation statistics.

Lastly, the results of the interlibrary loan policy question were not unexpected. Again, these objections to interlibrary loaning of videos could well be due to their newness in the collection and to the lack of standardization in their storage and retrieval.

It is hoped that these comparisons of video and book circulation policies and statistics will help to develop the standardization needed to bring about better usage of one of the newer media in library collections.

Bibliography

Burns, Grant. "We Are Not Vidiots." Library Journal 115 (November 15, 1990): 40-41.

Caron, Barbara. "Video Cassette in the Public Library." West Virginia Libraries 37 (Fall 1984): 14-15.

Dewing, Martha, ed. Home Video in Libraries: How Libraries Buy and Circulate Prerecorded Home Video. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1988.

G., G. "Libraries Fight to Keep Fee-Based Video Lending." American Libraries 18 (June 1987): 412.

"Maryland Contemplates Library Exemption for Video Cassette Fees." Library Journal 113 (April 15, 1988): 24.

Mainly, Will. "Facing the Public." Wilson Library Bulletin 64 (June 1990): 89-90.

Tuteur, Civia. "Books into Videos." Illinois Libraries 70 (January 1988): 64-66.

"Video Lending by Public Libraries Draws Strong Criticism." Library Journal 113 (April 15, 1988): 22.

Watkins, Jim. "Patron Perception and Use of Popular Nonprint Materials in Public Libraries." Public Libraries 26 (Fall 1987): 109-112.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Book and Video Circulation Questionnaire

1. What is the population your library serves?
   a. less than 10,000
   b. 10,001 - 15,000
   c. 15,001 - 20,000
   d. 20,001 - 25,000
   e. 25,001 - 30,000
   f. 30,001 - 35,000
   g. more than 35,001

2. Do you have videos in your collection for patron use (outside the library)?

   YES NO

   If you answered NO, you need go no further. Please return this survey in the enclosed envelope. If you answered YES, please continue.

3. How many video titles does your library have in its collection?

4. How many books does your library have in its collection?

5. How many videos were checked out to patrons in each of the following fiscal years?

   1991 - 1988 -

   1990 - 1987 -

   1989 -

6. How many books were checked out to patrons in each of the following fiscal years?

   1991 - 1988 -

   1990 - 1987 -

   1989 -

7. Do you charge for video use?

   YES NO

8. If you answered yes to #7, how much do/did you charge?

9. If you formerly charged for videos, when did you stop? Please make sure you answer question #8.

10. How long is your video check out period?
    a. 1 day
    b. 2 days
    c. 3 days
    d. 4 days
    e. 5 days
    f. 1 week
    g. 2 weeks

11. How do you shelve your videos?

a. all together alphabetically by title
b. fiction by title, nonfiction in separate location by call number
c. fiction by title, nonfiction on regular shelves with other nonfiction
d. other: Please describe.

12. Are the videos listed in your card catalog?

YES NO

13. If no to #12, how do you let your patrons know what is available?

14. How many videos may your patrons check out at a time? (Individual titles, some videos are on more than one tape)

a. 1
b. 2
c. 3
d. 4
e. no limit

15. Who may check out videos from your library?

a. adults only with a card from your library
b. anyone with a card from your library
c. anyone in SLS (reciprocal borrowers)
d. anyone (including Chicago patrons with a Suburban Library System card

16. Do you let your videos go out on interlibrary loan?

YES NO

17. If no to #16, why?

18. Are these the same rules that apply to book circulation? (interlibrary loan)

YES NO

19. If no to #18, what are the differences?

Thank you for participating in this survey. If you are interested in the results, I will be glad to send you my findings. Please indicate: YES NO and what library.

1 Not in library use.

TABLE #1 LIBRARIES BY POPULATION
(With 51 of 84 libraries answering)

Less than 10,000	29.41%
10,001 - 15,000	2.49 %
15,001 - 20,000	5.88 %
20,001 - 25,000	7.80 %
25,001 - 30,000	9.80 %
30,001 - 35,000	5.88 %
More than 35,001	11.76%

TABLE #2A VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION *
POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
2	NA / -8.03	NA / -8.64	NA / 5.72	NA / -8.64
8	7.35 / .20	8.53 / -5.25	-17.38 / 3.18	-18.33 / 2.08
12	NA / NA	NA / NA	8.34 / 7.03	-11.64 / 4.54
17	24.34 /	96.11 /	41.31 /	11.00 /
21	NA / -.98	86.76 / 10.68	13.37 /-2.23	34.40 / 38.12
22	NA / 2.52	NA /-15.41	NA / 5.68	NA / 21.21
25	5.75 / -6.47	1.93 / .53	9.26 /-4.92	28.99 / 50.97
32	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA
34	-24.68 / 14.56	17.24 / -4.07	27.45 /-4.10	-26.15 / 13.26
38	- 2.70 / -2.80	1.93 / 8.23	-4.45 / 1.70	- .22 / 9.74
41	308.68 / -7.95	29.98 /-11.69	-25.28 /-1.95	57.16 / -6.90
46	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA
47	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA

* Note: Libraries 6, 19, 20, and 28 are not included as they do not own videos
NA means the library gave no statistics for that year
All numbers are percents
Video circulation percentages are listed first

TABLE #2B VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION *
POPULATION 10,001 - 15,000

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
1	-16.62 / -4.92	- .41 / -6.13	-25.92 / -2.94	84.90 / 32.07
5	NA /	NA /	NA /	NA /
10	NA /	NA /	NA /	NA /
11	107.17 / -7.80	154.09 / -2.98	4.77 / 6.85	14.91 / 58.62
14	NA / .24	NA / -3.11	NA / 4.37	NA / 4.72
23	15.98 / 2.04	38.68 / 7.46	8.09 / 2.38	6.55 / 4.92
24	30.70 / - .62	-12.20 / 4.21	.13 / -7.16	9.27 / 9.06
33	NA / -5.87	-22.08 / -2.83	8.92 / 38.29	-15.98 /-21.38
35	NA / -6.28	NA / 3.91	967.12 / -1.90	450.83 / 5.64
36	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA
42	NA / NA	-10.43 / NA	36.19 / 8.38	20.49 / 21.44
43	7.15 / - .24	38.74 / 17.98	19.07 / -2.47	-6.34 / 8.76
49	5.74 /-10.22	-27.55 /-10.34	- 4.23 / 19.40	65.31 / 20.22

See Note Table 2A

TABLE #2C VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION
POPULATION 15,001 - 20,000

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
29	NA / - .35	NA / - .16	NA /- .44	NA / 3.09
39	NA / -3.43	NA / .32	104.34 / 8.68	11.63 / 9.70

See Note Table 2A

TABLE #2D VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION
POPULATION 20,001 - 25,000

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
3	NA / 7.72	-8.20 / 4.18	60.20 / 8.92	-5.73 / 3.95
15	NA / NA	640.90 / .89	18.10 /-2.87	54.16 / 3.89
30	NA / NA	NA / NA	34.92 /12.20	.07 /-1.20
45	NA / NA	NA / NA	- 9.53 / NA	58.41 / NA
50	34.69 / -6.17	15.76 / 9.68	26.03 / .67	-4.41 /-1.37

See Note Table 2A

TABLE #2E VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION
POPULATION 25,001 - 30,000

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
26	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA
31	14.71 / .35	26.79 / -1.48	2.30 / 2.26	7.22 /17.55
40	NA / 3.60	4.20 / 16.77	-11.77 / .35	15.17 / 9.62
48	-46.14 / 14.05	149.24 / 5.21	148.04 /23.87	584.21 /18.55
51	- 8.91 / 6.10	37.00 / -2.59	-26.55 /-2.70	8.73 /-2.10

See Note Table 2A

TABLE #2F VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION
POPULATION 30,001 - 35,000

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
13	NA / 10.56	NA / 15.09	NA / 6.47	NA /12.20
16	NA / NA	NA / .89	NA /-2.87	NA / 3.89
27	77.55 / - .76	20.44 / 3.22	21.72 / 4.25	-6.01 /-4.55

See Note Table 2A

TABLE #2G VIDEO AND BOOK CIRCULATION

POPULATION MORE THAN 35,001

LIBRARY #	1988	1989	1990	1991
4	42.03 /11.85	176.35 / 1.64	109.40 / 6.24	15.84 /-8.57
7	-10.96 /-1.31	40.60 / 6.35	52.25 / 7.61	83.94 / 7.25
9	- .56 / 5.88	.79 / 4.79	16.89 / .98	16.99 / 6.62
18	NA / -.76	605.02 / 7.32	46.51 / 1.68	226.85 / 3.75
37	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA
44	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA	NA / NA

See Note Table 2A

TABLE #3 CEASED CHARGING FOR VIDEOS AND CIRCULATION

LIBRARY #	WHEN STOPPED	1988	1989	1990	1991
29	April 1991	-16.62	-.41	-25.92	84.90
9	November 1990	- .56	.79	16.89	16.99
40	July 1991	NA	4.20	-11.77	15.17